



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,918	03/19/2004	Thomas G. Hallin	CE10557W	8360

23330 7590 03/21/2006

MOTOROLA, INC.  
LAW DEPARTMENT  
1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD  
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/804,918

Applicant(s)

HALLIN, THOMAS G.

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060130.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Detailed Action***

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 01/30/2006. Claims 1, 17 and 21 have been amended. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-2, 21-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shiga et al. (US 2004/0083282 A1), hereinafter “Shiga”.**

4. As to claim 1, Shiga teaches a method for registering multiple communications devices, comprising:

identifying a communication device for registration by a user for providing an identified communication device (*identifying terminal ID “a1”, “a2”, “b1”, etc.*) (Shiga, Fig. 12A, paragraphs [8-10] and [0038]);

setting a priority for the identified communication device (*Fig. 12A*); and

storing the identified communication device and the priority corresponding to the identified communication device in the database (*storing terminals a1, a2, b1 and their corresponding priority*) (Shiga, Fig. 12A and paragraph [0038]).

5. As to claim 2, Shiga teaches the method of claim 1, further receiving and storing the IP address in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device (*storing IP address "192.168.0.1:4567" corresponding to the terminal a1*) (Shiga, Fig. 12A and paragraph [0038]).

6. Claims 21-22 and 25 are corresponding database entry claims of claims 1-2; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 3-16 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiga, in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 2004/0162870 A1), hereinafter "Matsuzaki".**

9. As to claim 3, Shiga teaches the method of claim 2, but does not explicitly teach setting a registration time of the identified communication device and storing the registration time in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device.

In a related art, Matsuzaki teaches a method and system for registering client devices, wherein the registered device list (*i.e.*, *table/database*) as illustrated in Fig. 4 comprises the registered communication device CLIENT ID, REGISTRATION DATE-TIME at which the client device identified by the CLIENT ID is registered with the server, etc. (Matsuzaki, Fig. 4 and paragraphs [0063-0064] and [0067]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Shiga and Matsuzaki to include setting a registration time of the identified communication device and storing the registration time in an entry in the database corresponding to the identified communication device since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to register both the CLIENT ID to identify the user devices and the REGISTRATION DATE-TIME to keep track of the date and time at which the client device is registered with the system (Matsuzaki, paragraphs [0064] and [0067]).

10. As to claim 4, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 3, further including selecting an expiration registration time corresponding to the identified communication device and based upon a type of identified communication device (*when registering the client device 200, the server 100 may generate expiry information showing a time period*

during which the registration with the server 100 remains valid); and storing the expiration registration time in an entry of the database corresponding to the identified communication device (*storing the expiration registration time as WITHDRAWAL DATE-TIME field as illustrated in Fig. 4*) (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303]).

11. As to claim 5, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 4, further including a step of determining by the communication system whether the identified communication is currently registered (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0298]).

12. As to claim 6, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 5, further including steps of changing the IP address for the currently registered identified communication device; and storing the changed IP address in the entry of the identified communication device in the database (*storing the changed IP address in the Terminal Management Table as illustrated in Fig. 12A of Shiga*).

13. As to claims 7-8, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 5, further including the steps of selecting a registration time by the communication system for the database corresponding to the identified communication device and selecting an expiration registration time based upon a type of identified communication device (*since the client device is registered only for a time period shown by the expiry information, the server monitors passage of time and the registration is automatically canceled at the expiry of the time period*) (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303] and [0305]).

14. As to claims 9-10, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 8, further including a step of selecting the expiration registration time for a first type of identified communication device such as a computer to be a first value approximately 1 hour *(when registering the client device 200, the server 100 may generate expiry information showing a time period during which the registration with the server 100 remains valid, wherein the expiration registration time could be set at 1 hour for a computer as implemented by the server/administrator)* (Matsuzaki, paragraph [0303]).

15. Claims 11-12 contain similar limitations as method claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

16. As to claim 13, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 11, further including selecting the priority of the identified communication device based upon the type of the identified communication device *(i.e., based upon the media usable at the particular terminal)* (Shiga, paragraphs [0061-0062]).

17. As to claim 14, Shiga-Matsuzaki teaches the method of claim 13, further including the steps of selecting a first priority based upon a location of a mobile station or based on manual registration; selecting a second priority for an automatic registration or re-registration *(the priorities are established according to specific rules, or policies that could be implemented as location, automatic/manual registration, or re-registration)*; (Shiga, paragraphs [0036]).

Art Unit: 2141

18. Claims 15-16 are corresponding iterating method claims of claims 1-14; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claims 23-24 are corresponding database entry claims of method claims 3-4; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

**20. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepper et al. (US 5,930,700), hereinafter "Pepper", in view of Shiga.**

21. As to claim 17, Pepper teaches a system and method for automatically screening and directing incoming calls, comprising the steps of:

receiving by a network a call to the registered user (*the network 300 receives a call coming in for a subscriber from a communication device 302*) (Pepper, col. 5, lines 20-22 and col. 6, lines 12-17);

accessing an entry of a database for the registered user (*the system refers to the subscriber's schedule found in the DateBook database in order to determine at what address/phone number, i.e., at what device the subscriber is currently located*) (Pepper, col. 6, lines 33-37);

coupling the expedited call to a communication device of the multiple communication devices (*depending on the subscriber's schedule, the call maybe connected directly to the subscriber at the selected number, i.e., the selected device, or to any other predetermined call delivery address*) (Pepper, col. 6, lines 39-42).



However, Pepper does not explicitly teach selecting by the network a device having a highest priority in the entry of the database.

In a related art, Shiga teaches a system and method of selecting a receiving terminal for multimedia communication based on the dynamic situation of the receiving user as well as the priority assigned to each registered terminal, wherein the terminal with highest priority is determined as the receiving terminal (Shiga, paragraphs [0008] and [0061-0062]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pepper and Shiga to select a device having a highest priority in the entry of the database since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to automatically select a proper one of plural registered communication devices at a particular time point, based on the dynamic situation of the receiving user as well as the priority assigned to each terminal (Shiga, paragraph [0008]).

22. As to claim 18, Pepper-Shiga teaches the method of claim 17, further comprising:

for the registered user, determining from the database whether a registration expiration timer has expired; and if so, discarding by the network a corresponding entry in the database (*the daily appointment calendar 908 allows the subscriber to indicate at what call delivery address, i.e., what device, the subscriber may be reached during certain times of the day only, e.g., from 10AM - 11AM*) (Pepper, col. 9, lines 22-25).

23. As to claim 19, Pepper-Shiga teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising:  
determining by the network whether there is more than one communication device of the registered user having the highest priority; and if there is not, sending by the network the call to the communication device having the highest priority (Shiga, paragraphs [0061-0062]).

24. As to claim 20, Pepper-Shiga teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising sending the call to the communication device having the most recent registration time (Shiga teaches a policy management table 18 for storing the rules/policies for selecting a receiving terminal based on the conditions, i.e. the rules/conditions could be obviously implemented to select the communication device having the most recent registration time for connection) (Shiga, paragraph [0036]).

25. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 01/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


27. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

Art Unit: 2141

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER